		; ; ;	
		£	
·	50X1-HUM		6
AT THE ACADEMY OF MEDICAL SCIENCES, USSR			
Source:			
Meditsinskiy Rabotnik No 28, 6 Apr 52		·	
			5
			•

THE PROMISE AND A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE

4

ABOUT THE ACADEMY OF MEDICAL SCIENCES, USSR (Taken from Medintsinskiy Rabotnik No 28, 6 Apr 1952)

Professor L. M. Shabad, director of the Division of Oncology of the Institute of Normal and Pathological Morphology, gave a report before the Presidium of the Academy of Medical Sciences, in which he defended the work of his organization and claimed that research has been reorganized on the basis of Pavlov's principles. The orientation of Shabad's theories was generally attacked by those present as deviating from Pavlov's principles, Shabad was called a follower of Wirchow, and was criticized for stubbornly refusing to change his theoretical views. Additional particular charges were made by the property and the following failing to carry out an order of the Presidium to develope experimental therapy of cancer and to further the experiments of M. K. Petrova (Vice-President of the Academy N. N. Zhukov-Verezhnikov); conducting research which has little practical significance (Chief Oncologist of the Ministry of Health USSR S. N. Anfilogov); failing, for many years, to make a substantial contribution to clinical practice although excellent provisions were made for the work of Shabad's division (Professor A. A. Solov'ev); Shabad's assertion on the decisive role of specific endogenous carcinogenic bodies denies physiological and morphological precancerous changes in the etiopathogenesis of tumors, is completely unfounded, and leaves no prospect for prophylaxis and treatment of malignant tumors (Professor L. F. Larionov and Candidate of Biological Sciences N. I. Lazarev); personnel training within the division is very poor, and incompetent personnel are maintained on the staff (Professor B. V. Ognev). Professors M. A. Skvortsov, A. I. Savitskiy and A. I. Westerov also participated in the discussion.

The closing words of L. M. Shabad showed that he has not heeded criticism, and persists in his erroneous views.

Professor N. N. Blokhin and Candidate of Biological Sciences P. N. Resnichenko noted that before the criticism of Shabad's work, SEGRET

## allinti

## SECHET

a project of a resolution had been prepared by the Presidium, which proposed praising Shabad's division.

Surprisingly enough, the Presidium of the Academy was not sufficiently prepared to discuss Professor Shabad's report, and could not take appropriate action.